Smith's Report

No. 191 *Challenging the Holocaust Taboo Since 1990* May 2012
Online at www.codoh.com

The Student Press Illustrates Once Again The Depth of the Holocaust Taboo In the American University

Bradley Smith

The Belfer First Step Workshop on the Holocaust is a program created by the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum to prepare pre-service secondary teachers to integrate the Holocaust into their lesson plans effectively. I learned about the Workshop in *The Anchor,* the student newspaper at Rhode Island College.

It is worth noting that the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum is a proactive State agency, funded by tax dollars, dedicated to forwarding the State narrative that during World War II the Germans were uniquely monstrous. It is a narrative that has been carried out brilliantly in the name of various American war parties, spearheaded in the university by Hillel and the ADL, but infecting all media and intellectual classes.

Rhode Island College was one of six institutions of higher education across the nation selected by the USHMM to host the Belfer Workshop. The other five included Auburn University, Cal State U Long Beach, Illinois State University, St. Cloud State, and the University of Northern Colorado. The day after encountering this material we submitted announcements to the online editions of the student newspaper at each of these campuses. In each instance the text of the announcement read:

"INCONVENIENT HISTORY: The Power of Taboo."

Six words. The text itself is a link which, when the student clicks on it, will take her to the Website of *Inconvenient History*. In the latest issue of that journal she will find, among other papers, the 9,000-word word paper by Germar Rudolf titled "Resistance Is Obligation." The ad was accepted by *The UNC Mirror* at U Northern Colorado, by *The Chronicle* at St. Cloud U., and by *The Anchor* at Rhode Island College.

I wrote *The UNC Mirror* to congratulate the editor for standing with the ideal a free press. I wrote the advisor of *The Daily 49er* to express my dismay—well, not my dismay, I'm well acquainted with how "advisors" to the student press operate in the American university—but my disapproval of such advice.

The point to these simple, almost pro-forma letters is not to communicate with a single individual editor or advisor, but to copy each letter to hundreds of student organizations and faculty on each of the six campuses so that it is

understood widely how a minority of student editors can stand with the ideal of a free press in spite of what they are being advised and pressured to do by special interests.

While the editor who folds is responsible for her actions, I understand fully the difficult position she is in, and how she is being asked to risk her position on the paper she is working for now, and upon graduation risk losing the possibility of working in journalism anywhere. It's not fair, not right, but the culpability rests with a professoriate that betrays its own ideals as it betrays its students.

And this time we all—students, faculty, and CODOH itself—were to benefit from the unexpected involvement of **Heinz Bartesch**. You will find his open letter at the end of this article. And then there is the large send we did to introduce Eric Hunt's *The Last Days of the Big Lie* to the Six we are talking about here and to some 20 other campuses across the nation.

Meanwhile, here is my brief letter to the *UNC Mirror* editor.

Friday, March 16, 2012

Benjamin Welch,
Editor-in-Chief -
The UNC Mirror
U of Northern Colorado
Greeley, Colorado

Mr. Welch:

I would like you to know that we very much appreciate the fact that the *UNC Mirror* has agreed to run our announcement for "Inconvenient History: The Power of Taboo." Clicking on the link your readers are taken to the Website of "Inconvenient History: A Quarterly Journal for Free Historical Inquiry."

The Spring 2012 issue includes:

Editorial: Book burning in the Style of 2011

Resistance Is Obligation

Ritual Defamation: A Contemporary Academic Example

Stephen F. Pinter, An Early Revisionist

A Postcard from Treblinka

Review: The Wandering Who

The Palestinians as an "Invented People"

Relegation--A Formula for Blowback

We advocate a free exchange of ideas about a series of historical questions that are taboo with the American professoriate across the nation. Example: I doubt that there is one academic at U Northern Colorado who openly supports a free exchange of ideas with regard to Holocaust orthodoxy. Or one academic who will encourage, or even allow, such a free exchange of ideas to take place on this matter in his/her classroom,

All this being so, I understand that you are in a difficult situation. Still, we encourage the *UNC Mirror* to continue to support the right to free inquiry against the opposition of UNC academics and administration. And, I should add, the opposition of a number of special-interest organizations on and off-campus that you may hear from.

Sincerely,
Bradley Smith

PS: I understand I might be wrong about any particular of the above. If I am, please tell me where and I will acknowledge my error publicly.

Do you want to talk about it?

You can reach me at *bradley1930@yahoo.com*

At the same time, the announcement was rejected out of hand by *The Plainsman* at Auburn University, *The Daily 49er* at Cal State Long Beach, and *The Vidette* at Illinois State U. *The Anchor* at Rhode Island College was an exception. *The Anchor* does not publish ads in its online edition, but accepted ours for its hardcopy edition. The ad ran one time but was pulled before it could run a second week. I wrote the editor of *The Anchor* and again we copied it to hundreds of student organizations and faculty on the RIC campus, then to the other campuses in The Six.

George Bissell, Editor-in-Chief
The Anchor
Rhode Island College
Providence, Rhode Island
editorinchief@anchorweb.org

20 March 2012

Mr. Bissel:

Earlier this month we submitted an announcement to run in *The Anchor* that read: "Inconvenient History: The Power of Taboo,"

Continued on page 10

FRAGMENTS: Another Ordinary Life

Bradley Smith

*** Each afternoon a few minutes before 5pm my wife and I drive downtown to our mail drop hoping to find, among other interesting material, substantial contributions to help with the work. Sometimes it's there, sometimes not. I need to average about $100 a day, or $3,000 a month, just to keep the work above water. Today there was one contribution for $25. When I told my wife that total contributions for the day were $25 she said in Spanish:

"You need to thank God for it. He's the one who gave it to you."

"He's the one?"

"That's right, Gordo."

"Does that mean it was God who gave me the cancer?"

"Why shouldn't God give you cancer?" she said."Who do you think you are? He gives you everything. You are already past the years when you should die."

"I see."

"Who are you?" she said.

It was kind of comic. I didn't say anything more. That's the way she talks to me about the really big issues related to life and the world of the divine. I have a photograph of her as a child in a village in *Nayarit*. She's standing in the dirt, no shoes. Ordinarily she has a terrific sense of humor, but the set of her jaw in that photograph from some sixty years ago predicts a strength of character that would come to rule her life as a Christian.

*** Joseph Campbell (*The Power of Myth*) was being interviewed on PBS by Bill Moyers when Campbell remarked that "History is a nightmare from which we are trying to awake." Remarkable image.

I recall reading Campbell (and Jung) after Korea, in 1953 maybe, sitting at night at the kitchen table while mother and father sat in the living room watching Roller Derby, or Jackie Gleason or All in the Family. All in the Family was a pretty good show.

On another PBS program, a documentary where a U.S. naval ship is trying to interdict pirates off the Somali coast, a crew was preparing to board a suspect ship. The Americans were all young guys. As they went over the side of their own ship to get into a small boarding vessel, the young man directing them said:

"Okay now. Keep your heads on swivel."

I'd never heard that expression. Cool.

*** The USHMM has a page on its Web site (http://tinyurl.com/7tyo7ek) devoted to a Timeline for key events in the evolution of Holocaust Denial, an activity "generally motivated by hatred of Jews."

We are not told what other motivations there might be to question the H story. Like a felt necessity for free inquiry? There are 31 of these key personages and events listed in the Timeline, beginning with the Germans and their collaborators destroying evidence of mass graves in Poland, the Soviet Union, Serbia and Germany in 1942/43.

All the names you are familiar with are there, beginning with Willis Carto and on through the major figures of Robert Faurisson, Arthur Butz, Harry Elmer Barnes, Ernst Zundel, David McCalden, and some who are tangential to revisionism—Gerald L.K. Smith? And then there is Bradley Smith.

"**1987**: California-based Bradley Smith founds the Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust. During the early 1990s, Smith's organization places full-page advertisements or editorial pieces in more than a dozen American college newspapers under the headline 'The Holocaust Story: How Much is False? The Case for Open Debate.' Smith's campaign helps to blur the line between hate mongering and freedom of speech."

I quote this item in the Timeline because of the final assertion: that arguing the case for open debate "helps to blur" the line between hate mongering and freedom of speech. Freedom of speech—a very difficult issue for these people to deal with, even the most educated among them.

But here is the entry that took me by surprise. Among the 31 persons and events listed in the USHMM Timeline covering the 70 years since 1942, the last, final event listed is this one.

"**2010**: Bradley Smith places his first online Holocaust denial advertisement, which appears on the website of the University of Wisconsin's *Badger Herald* in February. The Internet—because of its ease of access and dissem-

ination, seeming anonymity, and perceived authority—is now the chief conduit of Holocaust denial."

A seven-word announcement in a student newspaper. One of the 31 most significant revisionist events in the 70 years since 1942! Publication of the ad did cause a commotion, including a response from the director of the USHMM herself, the charming but misled Sara J. Bloomfield.

I believe I am doing something that badly needs to be done. To call out university faculty before the eyes of their students, to demonstrate to students how they are being held in bondage by their professors to a set of historical issues that are ruled by taboo rather than thought. .

But I didn't expect the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum itself to publicly affirm the value of my work in such a striking manner.

Sara?

Thank you.

*** I find on Ynetnews.com that a Google search of the term "al-holocaust al-falastini" (The Palestinian holocaust) elicited 446,000 results, while a search of "al-holocaust al-yahudi" (the Jewish holocaust) elicited 496,000 results. At the same time the term "al-holocaust al-yahudia lmazoum" (the bogus Jewish holocaust) elicited 202,000 results. Holocaust revisionism. Getting the message out.

*** My wife has talked about having high blood pressure for some twenty years. She's always taken care of it, like she takes care of everything. Because she never made a scene about it, because I never heard that a doctor had told her she was in trouble, I didn't pay much attention. One night last week she was in the kitchen washing dishes when she said she had a pain in her chest. I had never heard her say that. Then she said she was having palpitations in her heart. I had never heard her say that either. I suggested we check her blood pressure.

We went in the bedroom, sat on the bed, hooked her up and did it. The numbers were 197 over 105.

She put her pajamas on, got into bed and closed her eyes. I just sat there. I had never seen such numbers. After a few minutes I said I thought the numbers were too high, that while it might be our machine, maybe it wasn't, and that we ought to drive to the Red Cross in town and have the numbers worked up again. Turns out she was half thinking the same thing but it was after midnight now and she didn't want to be a bother. We got dressed, got in the Jeep and drove to the Red Cross. Within a few minutes they had her numbers again. The numbers were 176 over 100.

The young doctor working that night, an unpleasant fellow, said that the 100 number was a turning point, anything higher increased the risk of heart attack or stroke at any moment, and advised us to allow him to put a capsule of something under her tongue to bring the pressure down within half an hour to two hours. We said go ahead. Half an hour later the numbers were 153 over 90. High but high-normal, with no immediate risk.

Since that night the diastolic number has reached 100 twice. She put a prescribed capsule under her tongue each time and the numbers dropped dramatically. Temporarily. So my wife has an authentic problem with high blood pressure. We have to stay on top of it.

Life.

*** Received a note from the Mid-County Regional Library, Florida. The Subject was:"Flyers at the Mid-County Regional Library.

Dear Sir,

Please be advised that the library does not permit display of personal materials on the public kiosks or bulletin boards. We ask that you cease placement of your materials immediately. If you have any questions about library policies, please contact Evie Kennedy, Regional Librarian at 941-613-3190.

Judy Domzalski. Library Technician - Mid County Regional Library, Charlotte County Community Services Department Libraries and History941.613.3181

Judy.Domzalski@charlottefl.com

Please note: Florida has a very broad public records law. Most written communications to or from officials regarding county business are public records available to the public and media upon request. Your e-mail communications may therefore be subject to public disclosure.

I replied to Ms. Domzalsk that she would have to fill me in here as I had no knowledge of what she was referring to with regard to "your materials."

In the event, Ms.Domzalsk has not filled me in. Must have been a local revisionist activist.

Continued on page 15

If Germany Declared Peace

Nicholas Kollerstrom

Germany has been, since World War II, an occupied nation. No peace treaty has ever been signed, occupying armies still remain there—and Germany continues to function under a foreign constitution, prepared by the victors of WW2.[1] It owns a massive amount of gold, three and a half thousand tons of it, more than any country except America—but is not in possession of it.

The time has now come for Germany to *declare peace.* Following the decision to pull out all 20,000 British troops from Germany by 2020,[2] this is an appropriate moment. Likewise the 73,000 U.S. soldiers and their 100,000 family members still in Germany should no longer be required to stay.

Let Germany *sign a peace treaty* with the postwar occupying nations (the US, UK, France and Russia), and announce that it is no longer an occupied nation. What would the sovereignty of Germany mean, in the 21st century?

Pacific Intentions

It is inevitable that Germany is—and will be—mighty. Let it show this might by *refusing* to send its own military outside its own national borders. A mistake may have been made by it accompanying NATO strikes in Bosnia, Afghanistan, and Libya. Let it be affirmed and printed in German military-law manuals that its soldiers will not go outside German national boundaries even if ordered to do so, unless on a humanitarian relief mission and invited by the country concerned (or else in accord with the terms of the defensive 1949 North Atlantic Treaty,[3] which it signed).

The two World Wars were triggered by uncertainties about the borders of Germany: now that these are established, let Germany make clear that there is no further *casus belli* that it will accept. In a sense both World Wars were caused by the geographical spread of persons who felt themselves to be German being larger than the national boundaries (of 1871) of the new nation of Germany. It was confusion over the definition of what was Germany. Germany never wanted to fight Britain in either World War.[4] It should no longer accept the guilt constantly foisted upon it by the victorious WW2 powers, who dropped *two million tons* of bombs onto central Europe, mainly Germany. That does not give them any moral platform from which to prate at Germany.

That is now well past, and let it fade into history. Let Germany join the ranks of pacific nations, who do not attack others: India, Brazil, Venezuela, Iran. Let Germany not sell more nuclear submarines to Israel.

The US and UK are two nations which cannot exist without everlasting war (and likewise their child, Israel). Let Germany dissociate itself from them, by declaring its national independence and sovereignty. Let it declare peace. Let it have the inner strength to say "No" when requested to send its military abroad by the US/UK for some war—i.e., declare that it wishes to abide by the 1949 North Atlantic Treaty.

Let Germany's military develop defensive strategies that lack provisions for entering other nations.

A peacemaker uses the art of balance, of balancing rival powers, and German statesmanship, at the centre of Europe, has to involve that. For example, suppose Germany declared that it would allow only one-tenth of US bases to remain in Germany and only with the proviso that none of their nuclear missiles were targeting Russia. That would send a shock all around the world. It would make people smile. A majority of Germans might (possibly) wish to retain the NATO "nuclear umbrella" of deterrence, and that would involve such a minimal US presence. Motion on such fundamental issues needs to be based upon the *majority will* of German citizens. In reply, the US declares it cannot divulge its nuclear policies to a host nation. Germany has requested a de-Gaulle strategy of "*à toutes azimuths*"—i.e. the nuclear missiles are there and ready, but not targeted at anyone! What would happen next? Such a move would at least give everyone an exciting topic of conversation.

The hand of the peacemaker is gentle but has to have power behind it. In response, Germany might affirm that it would no longer be able to pay expenses of the US/UK troops stationed in Germany.

Whenever the US/UK misuses the UN for its war making, then let Germany affirm the UN principle that member-states have undertaken "to settle any inter-national dispute in which they may be involved by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security and justice are not endangered, and to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations."

When Germany exports arms, let these be, as far as possible, defensive technology, e.g. short-range anti-aircraft missiles. This matters because German technology can readily become the best in the world—indeed, maybe already is.

Freeing the Historians

Let Germany cease putting its own citizens in jail for thought-crime,[5] let it cease burning books written by Germans but instead allow its own historians to write its history. Let its historians finally walk free from jail.

Let German scientists ratify that a certain object of technology has not ever existed in the world, and could not ever feasibly be constructed: viz. the mass cyanide human gas-chamber. That concept was only ever mere US/UK wartime atrocity propaganda. Nobody died in WW2 from being put into these, because they have never existed. Let Germans *cease taking blame* for this.

If SS-fighters did in the 1940s believe in "lebensraum," i.e. expanding somewhat into Russia, that belief originated *because of* the naval blockade which Britain imposed in 1918 to force Germany to sign the unfair Treaty of Versailles. That caused three quarters of a million to die of famine, mainly German women and children, because Germany could not feed itself: the one, real atrocity story of WW1,[6] terminating a war which Germany did not want and did not start.[7] Maybe Germans should cease feeling guilty about that policy.

Let Germany cease paying out two or three billion *euros* to "Holocaust victims" every year—which mainly goes into the coffers of Israel.[8] Germany suffered enough deaths in the last World War[9]; it does not need to atone for the deaths of others. If people believe that the Nazi *Endlösung der Judenfrage* involved an *intention* to exterminate Jews, then let the German government offer a reward to anyone who can show documents expressing this intent—or showing that it happened. Let that judgment be made by a jury of German citizens.

Germany has just honored the 70th anniversary of the Wannsee conference: let it send a letter to the big Holocaust Memorial centre now located there, requesting any documents be produced showing a lethal intention. Maybe the decision there implemented of deporting Jews from Germany was regrettable, but if so it had been made on 46 earlier occasions by most other European countries. Debate on this question is possible—and maybe the future of Europe depends upon us having such a debate.

A slab at Auschwitz used to state that four million had been murdered there, a figure later reduced to one million, it being implied that Germans were responsible for this. In northern Germany the huge database at Bad-Arolsen now claims to contain *the complete archive* of all persons who lived and died in the German labour-camps during WW2:[10] do not its documents give a total of 73 thousand deaths at Auschwitz, and 290 thousand for all of the labour-camps? Let the German government permit free and open debate on this topic. Clearly, if the Arolsen archive has inadvertently omitted to record 95% of all wartime deaths at the Auschwitz labour-camp, then something would need to be done about this! That hardly sounds like German efficiency. The German government must not have any defined position on this matter, other than that of allowing historyians to debate the subject.

Clearly, a German government should not hold a view on any matter which requires historians to evaluate. But it might wish to request that the Arolsen Archive give an answer to the question posed recently by Jurgen Graf: "Can you adduce any documentary evidence proving that even a single Jew was killed in a gas chamber in any National Socialist concentration camp?"[11] It is time for the world to hear an answer to that—*the official answer*, from the Arolsen Archive management team. Having adjusted German law concerning the non-outlawing of historical truth, it could and should request the Arolsen Archive to state publicly its total, i.e the *total number of persons in its records*

who lived and died in the German WW2 labour-camps.

If and when it does these any of things, the US and UK media will respond with cries of "Nazi, Nazi!" and a particular ethnic group will claim to be "hurt." One then needs an inner strength not to respond. Let Germany recover its own self-identity and not allow others to define it. Twice in the 20th century were world wars (as opposed to local conflicts) precipitated by Britain declaring war on Germany; let Germany *stop feeling guilt* about this.

Condemnations of Nazism should apply equally to Zionism; as identical national ideologies, appearing in the 1930s, both based on racial superiority, racial purity, and military expansionism, they shared in common a drive to have Jews deported from Europe to Israel.

The Gentle Giant

Let Germany take a new pride in its old culture: a nation of musicians, poets, mystics, writers, artists, and philosophers. Let it thank the US/UK for writing out a German constitution after the War, but declare that it is no longer required—then write out its own. German culture has (I suggest) key characteristics of being *good* and *true*, with *thorough* workmanship, which is why the world needs it. Let it not accept the definitions which others keep wishing to give it.

A recent opinion poll found that 89% of Germans do not believe the official version of 9/11.[12] No other European nation has that depth of insight. That philosophical intelligence—that common intelligence shared by the German people—is able to *see through fabrications* made by US/UK military intelligence. That's why the world needs it

As regards the historical accident of Germany having more iron and coal under its soil than neighboring nations, let it cultivate an attitude of friendly benevolence by favorable trade deals to its near neighbors concerning these raw materials. Let it be the friendly giant of Europe.

Let it deal with the slow, gradual concept of "confidence-building measures" by way of reassuring any nervous neighbours of Germany's pacific intentions. Slowly, confidence is built up. Let it politely explain that German taxpayers will no longer pay stationing costs of foreign armies.

A Golden Question

Let Germany request back its gold from America.[13] Its massive gold reserves may not reside in the *Bundesbank* coffers,[14] but rather in Fort Knox, with some in London.[15] For comparison, Venezuela requested in 2011 that its gold be returned from deposits in the Bank of England and that has happened; its gold has now been *repatriated.* Germany would need to have its gold returned for these arguments of sovereignty to make sense.[16]

If and when Germany gets that gold back, let Germans consider in their hearts the concept of a gift: giving say five hundred tons of it to Russia, to heal memories of trauma between these two great nations, from the two world wars: an unsolicited gift. (This is a native American tradition of "potlatch"—of one tribe giving a gift to another, such that the recipient is obliged by the generosity.)

What is it that a pacific Germany should stand for? After the War its shattered cities lay desolated like lunar landscapes. Its recovery in the 21st century as a pacific nation would signify the resurrection of the human spirit (Mahler's 2nd "Resurrection" symphony). The primary questions are maybe not economic, about the fate of the euro, which everyone talks about, but are rather about the cultural self-identity of the German people.

---

1 Germany: Still under Control of Foreign Powers' by Ingrid Zündel, on *Veterans Today.*

2 Daily Mail, British remaining 20,000 troops begin withdrawal from Germany, 22.1.12

3 Greece was not a signatory to that 1949 treaty, so this affirmation does not risk Germany becoming embroiled in Greek/Turkish feuds.

4 See, e.g, .my 'On the Avoidability of WW1' *The Journal of Inconvenient History,* 2011,3.

5 UNESCO Human Rights Council ruling, 3 June 2010: "The exercise of the right to freedom of opinion and expression is one of the essential foundations of a democratic society, and is instrumental to the development and strengthening of effective democratic systems."

6 Propaganda for War Stewart Halsey Ross 2009, p.47.

7 NK op cit (4).

8 A 2007 survey showed that 85% of Germans favoured termination of such payments:

9 While estimates vary widely, here is one for 8 million German WW2 deaths:

10 www.its-arolsen.org/en/homepage/index.html

11 Jürgen Graf, 'Hungarian Holocaust debate'

12 Nearly 90% Germans don't believe Official 911 fairy tale: Infowars.

13 Would Germany get it back? Author of *Currency Wars* 2011 James

Rickards told Max Kaiser that he was told "most of Germany's gold is in NYC and this is a direct quote from ...the *Bundesbank*."
14 Currency War: Germany about to lose 66% of its gold reserves Max Kaiser 2010.

15 Where Is Germany's Gold? James Turk, Global Research
16 "It is no secret that the bulk of Germany´s national gold is not in Germany (and has not been since the 1960s when Germany has earned most of the gold through its trade surpluses)

but in NYC and London and a little bit in Paris, too. Even the *Bundesbank* itself has confirmed this part of the story several times – and "defended" that storage policy with "reasons of trading convenience and historical storage custom."

Sensation in France: Professor Faurisson Forces the CRIF (Jewish Lobby) into a Humiliating Retreat

Guillaume Fabien

April 2, 2012

The CRIF (Representative Council of Jewish Institutions in France) is the closest thing France has to the United States Jewish lobby's flagship organisation AIPAC (American Israel Public Affairs Commit-tee). Early each year, for example, the CRIF summons – more than it invites – to a solemn ceremonial dinner most of the country's government, starting with the President of the Republic, the Prime Minister, the Presidents of both the National Assembly and the Senate, and up to fifteen serving Ministers or Secretaries of State, not to mention a plethora of lofty figures from domestic and foreign political, economic, diplomatic, and media spheres.

On this occasion, ritually, those attending do not fail to listen religiously to the speech made by the CRIF's President. In flattering, complaining, and threatening tones he gives his lesson to France and dictates to the government the conduct to adopt in the near future so as better to heed the chosen people's desiderata. The government representatives who've taken in this lecture then vie in their obsequiousness, undertaking to do even better in the year just begun in bending to the edicts of this mighty body. For the CRIF the rights and privileges of the State of Israel are the priority of priorities. Its current president is Richard Prasquier, a round little man whose nerves often seem quite on edge.

The truth is as follows: neither before, during nor after my stay in Tehran did I receive, either from the Iranian president or any of his representatives, "a cheque for 120,000 euros" nor any other sum of money by cheque, cash in hand or any other means.

The *bête noire* of this president is historical revisionism and, therefore, Professor Robert Faurisson. In February 2012, Faurisson's visit to Iran and meeting with President Ahmadinejad, who bestowed on him the first-ever "award for courage, resistance and fighting spirit" and received him in a special audience, made Richard Prasquier lose control of his nerves. He posted three articles dealing with Faurisson on his organisation's website, all three under the name of an individual called Marc Knobel ("Faurisson and Ahmadinejad, the infernal couple" on February 15; "Far-right and Iran, the great love affair" on February 22; "Robert Faurisson, portrait of a Holocaust denier, [book] by Valerie Igounet" on March 15).

The pitch of these pieces steadily rose to the point where an emboldened Marc Knobel, who had begun by writing that Faurisson had "probably" received a cheque for €120,000 from President Ahmadinejad, ended up stating without reservation that the Professor had well and truly

received a cheque for that amount. There, at a stroke, probability had disappeared altogether; there was now just confirmation, a calm certainty.

In France there is a law enabling any person named or designated in an article to exercise what is called "the right of reply", and those in charge of the publication in question will have, upon receipt of the "reply" text, a period of five working days in which to publish it. One must be aware that the drafting of such a text is a consummate art. The gist of Professor Faurisson's letter to the CRIF was in the following sentence:

"The truth is as follows: neither before, during nor after my stay in Tehran did I receive, either from the Iranian president or any of his representatives, 'a cheque for 120,000 euros' nor any other sum of money by cheque, cash in hand or any other means."

Such wording adhered strictly to the requirements of legislation and case law. The CRIF was therefore obliged to publish the text, but decided not to do so.

Nonetheless news of the matter began to spread, notably with the publication, in Italy, of the brief paper the Professor had presented in Tehran ("Against Hollywoodism, Revisionism",

http://tinyurl.com/7u47zqa

This occurred in the daily *Rinascita* on February 21. That very day, the Jewish community of Rome demanded nothing less than the banning of the newspaper! It did so in an article entitled "*Faurisson che oltraggia la Shoah*" (Faurisson's outrage against the Shoah), http://tinyurl.com/8269dt3

In France, the CRIF website, in its press review of March 2, cited that article but – a noteworthy detail – without mentioning its demand for *Rinascita*'s closure. Soon afterwards, realising that the Professor was preparing to take them to court, Richard Prasquier and friends saw they were caught in the trap of their "aggravated lie" and, as the criminal or civil code puts it, of their "refusal of the right of reply" and the "personal injury" or "defamation" that they had brought about.

Thus did the almighty CRIF suddenly find itself forced into the most humiliating of back-downs. On March 21 the site posted, with the by-line of its trusted liar, Marc Knobel, a formal retraction: no, the Professor had received no cheque, no money! ("*Précision concernant un article sur Robert Faurisson*" – Clarification concerning an article on Robert Faurisson,"

http://tinyurl.com/88j92yn

The entertaining bit is that, when making his retraction, the liar found a way to slip in two "lies of omission" (of lesser calibre, it's true, than the original lie). Marc Knobel began by omitting the fact that after his article of February 15 he had, on February 22, reoffended, aggravating the charge made in his first piece. Then he left out the fact that the information prompting his back-down had come from a certain text whose existence he avoided mentioning at all: this was, precisely, the Professor's "right of reply" letter (see: *"Mensonge, reculade, et nouveau mensonge du CRIF"* – Lie, back-down, and new lie by the CRIF,"

http://tinyurl.com/7dngl2k

One may wonder whether this humiliation is the first of its kind ever endured by an institution which, drunk with power, believes itself to be above such a traditional and well-known French law as that of July 29, 1881 on "the freedom of the press."

As for Richard Prasquier, he incurs a heavy responsibility in all this business. For starters, by his refusal to grant Professor Faurisson a wholly justified "right of reply", he flouted the law. Then, to avoid the risk of a lawsuit, he turned to the liar Marc Knobel himself to have the lie corrected; the latter did that but, as we've seen, permitted himself two new lies in the process.

Even at the CRIF there must be honest people. Will they leave a President of the quality of Richard Prasquier in office for long?

As for Marc Knobel, he seems to like staying in the shadows: thanks to the historian Paul-Eric Blanrue, here he is for once out in the daylight, in all his loveliness.

[Photo removed by editor for technical reasons.]

"Frequently people think compassion and love are merely sentimental. No! They are very demanding. If you are going to be compassionate, be prepared for action." **Archbishop Desmond Tutu** (born 1931);

The Student Press and the Holocaust Taboo Continued from page 4

along with a URL that leads to the Website of *Inconvenient History: A Quarterly Journal for Free Historical Inquiry.* The Spring 2012 issue of the Journal includes:

Editorial: Book burning in the Style of 2011
Resistance Is Obligation
Ritual Defamation: A Contemporary Academic Example
Stephen F. Pinter, An Early Revisionist
A Postcard from Treblinka
Review: The Wandering Who
The Palestinians as an "Invented People"
Relegation--A Formula for Blowback

The ad appeared one time in *The Anchor* and then was suppressed because of the "reaction" of readers. We are not informed as to which readers, how many readers, if they were on-campus or off-campus readers, or what their problem was.

There is a special irony here in the fact that this week there will be a State-sponsored program, organized as the Belfer First Step Workshop on the Holocaust, presented at RIC on March 22, 23. The Workshop will focus on presenting an orthodox academic perspective on the history of a number of issues, incidents, and moralities of that fragment of World War II referred to as the "Holocaust." It is a given that nothing presented at such a function can be questioned publicly.

Just as it is with *The Anchor*.

We advocate a free exchange of ideas about a series of historical questions that are taboo with the American professoriate across the nation. Example: I doubt that there is one academic at Rhode Island College who openly supports a free exchange of ideas with regard to Holocaust orthodoxy. Or one academic who will encourage, or even allow, such a free exchange of ideas to take place in his/her classroom,

All this being so, I understand that you are in a difficult situation. Still, we encourage the RIC Anchor to continue to support the right to free inquiry, which is the primary ideal of the university in the West, against the opposition of RIC faculty and administration. And, I should add, that of a number of special-interest organizations on and off-campus that you may already have heard from.

Sincerely,
Bradley Smith

PS: I understand I might be wrong about any particular of the above. If I am, please tell me where and I will acknowledge my error publicly.

I can be reached at Bradley1930@yahoo.com

I received the following reply from Mr. Bissel, editor of *The Anchor.*

"Hello Bradley,

"I am responding to your complaint about the advertisement "Inconvenient History: The Power of Taboo," that ran in the last issue of The Anchor that came out on March 10. We have not had an issue come out since then because of Spring Break and our conference so no issues have passed since the advertisement last ran. Our ads manager made a mistake deciding to "pull the ad". He took this action without my knowledge and without my approval. The advertisement will run in The Anchor as long as you are willing to pay for it. We are a forum for free expression and the exchange of ideas, meaning that we will not censor any of our content. Our ads manager made a mistake and has been re-assigned. The Anchor would be willing to run the ad again as long as your organization is willing to pay for it.

"I hope this clears everything up and I thank you for bringing this situation to my attention. I was not aware that this action had been taken by my ads manager.

"If you have any questions, let me know."

George Bissell, *Editor-in-Chief*
The Anchor Newspaper
Rhode Island College's Student Newspaper
(cell) [deleted by editor]
(401)-456-8790 (office)

Here was a student editor willing to stand up to his peers, and to his "advisors," to the Hillel/ADL mishmash, and who knows who else? Meanwhile, I had fumbled payment of the ad. I called Bissell to tell him I wanted to straighten out the payment business but he did not respond.

After some ten days Hernandez was told via telephone that *The Anchor* had "made a mistake" in running the ad even one time, was

cancelling it, and would not accept a check for what it had already run. I can well imagine what Bissell had to go through, perhaps is still going through, with his "advisors" and with those representing Hillel and the ADL on and off his campus..

At the same time, our original announcement was rejected out of hand by *The Vidette* at Illinois State U, *The Daily 49er* at Cal State U at Long Beach, and *The Plainsman* at Auburn U. I wrote letters to the editor or advisor at each of these papers. Nothing original. Rather a pro forma version of the letter sent to *The Anchor* at RIC.

http://tinyurl.com/6n8vk77

An old-hat text for us, but a wake-up call to the hundreds of student organizations, faculty and administration that the letters were copied to, alerting one and all to *Inconvenient History* and through that page to CODOHWeb.

When I learned that *The University Chronicle* at St. Cloud University had accepted the ad, I congratulated the editor, Jun-Kai Teoh, as I had the editor of *UNC Mirror* at U Northern Colorado, copying it to student orgs, faculty and administration at St. Cloud U. The next day I received this note from the editor of *The Chronicle*, Jun-Kai Teoh:

From: Jun-Kai Teoh< editor@universitychronicle.net>
Sent: Sunday, April 8, 2012
Subject: University Chronicle online ad

Hello Brad,

I am Jun-Kai Teoh, the Editor-in-Chief at the University Chronicle, and I was made aware recently that the University Chronicle has run an ad for your organization. I would like to inform you that it was an oversight with the advertising department and that the ad has been taken down. Your payment will be refunded to you. The University Chronicle reserves the right to be selective with advertising, and we do not agree with the message, content or implications of your organization's ad.

Also, I request that you remove references of my name in any and all emails you send out, as the decision to run that ad was not made by me and was made by the ad manager.

I responded briefly:

Jun-Kai:

I agree that *The Chronicle* has the right to be selective with advertising, to run or not run what it chooses.

Re: how you were "made aware recently" that the ad was being run, I take it that you are making a reference, not to some neutral observation, but to a complaint, a protest. Can you reveal how you were "made aware," and by whom, or is that information to remain confidential?

Why do I want to know? That's where the story is, Kai, you know how it is. You're a journalist. The story behind such a story as this one (I will not pretend that it is a world-shaking story) but it is a real story. It has to do with a free press. It has to do with the ideal of a free exchange of ideas in the University itself. And it has to do with the radical idea that a routine examination of historical questions should be just that, routine. Not for some, but for all.

I wonder what your thinking is. Under your editorship will the University Chronicle publish only that with which it is absolutely in agreement with the message content and "implications" of a given text? Is that the route you are being "advised" to take?

And then there is the obvious question: which of the articles published in our quarterly, *Inconvenient History*, are most disturbing to you? And/or to your advisor/s?

-- Bradley

[Kai has not responded.]

During this back and forth I had alerted Heinz Bartesch to the story of the Belfer Workshop in *The Anchor*. It was reported there that Peter Black, Senior Historian at the USHMM, had addressed the case of Martin Bartesch. Heinz is the son of Martin Bartesch, who had been hounded to the end of his life by the Office of Special Investigations and media for having been assigned as a guard at Mauthausen and during his service there shot and killed an inmate who was trying to escape, which his duty required him to do.

Heinz wrote a memorable letter to *The Anchor* to question the activities of not only the OSI, but those of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum itself. *The Anchor*, to its credit, published the letter as a "comment."

It is worth emphasizing again that it is not just the letter we write to a specific editor or paper, but how we distribute the letter.

With regard to the letter by Heinz, which you will find below, as of this writing it has gone out to some 2,400 student organizations,

faculty and administration at the six Workshop campuses alone, to some 600 members of free-press organizations, and to the 800 online subscribers to *Smith's Report*.

Peter Black is the Senior Historian at the USHMM. He is quoted in the *RIC Anchor* as saying that the main goal of the OSI is denaturalization—revoking the citizenship of guilty perpetrators and sending them overseas to receive proper criminal punishment:

"In some cases, such as the case of Martin Bartesch, evidence was presented in a book entitled 'The Unnatural Death Book'. This book was a record of the deaths of inmates in concentration camps,

"This book was only able to survive because prisoners rescued it before American forces liberated the camps. In this book, it was recorded that Bartesch had shot and killed an inmate. Not only was there visible proof of Bartesch's crimes, but he also lied under oath to gain access into the country."

I prefaced Heinz's letter to *The Anchor* with a note to Senior Historian Peter Black to help orient the reader, the student, or the professor who received this text unexpectedly.

Heinz Bartesch Challenges Statements by USHMM Senior Historian

Kathelin Hurd, News Editor
The Anchor
Rhode Island College
Providence, Rhode Island
news@anchorweb.org

Your article (see link below this paragraph) would be considerably more truthful if it was entitled "Incorporating the Holocaust propaganda effectively into lesson plans" as I assure you this work-shop, or anything promoted by the US Holocaust Museum (USHMM), will be anything but true education as there will be only distorted facts presented and there won't be ANY opportunity for a student scholar to ask questions and present facts that dispute the presenters' claims.
http://tinyurl.com/729y7cx

Let me explain by using a simple example from the 'facts' you cite in the case of Martin Bartesch. I'm painfully familiar with the true facts as Martin was my father. First, let's begin with a little history lesson (which students assuredly won't get from the workshop); Martin was a 16yearold farm-boy living in Transylvania, Romania, when he was conscripted into the Waffen SS. I'll save you the details of what his life, and those of other ethnic Germans were like and how

Peter Black

they were caught in a war they didn't ask for or want for brevity sake.

However, as a 16 year old inductee, he just happened to be stationed in Mauthausen for several weeks before he was shipped off to the Eastern front to fight the Russians. During this time, which was used as training for his anti-tank battalion, he was also stationed as a perimeter guard. He never set foot inside the camp and had no say in what was going on. All he knew was he had orders to shoot anyone trying to escape. And this is unfortunately what happened when he shot Max Ochshorn, who was interned as a money forger, a criminal who would be imprisoned by any government anywhere (another fact that I'm certain this 'workshop' won't bother to cover).

It should be noted (but it won't) that when my father shot the escaping prisoner, he had to fill a complete report and was immediately relieved of duty until it was investigated. Not quite the MO for a regime that was intent on mass genocide, don't you think? It should also be mentioned (but it won't be) that this is the exact same orders that US GI's were given at the Japanese internment (concentration) camps and that US GI's did indeed shoot and kill escaping prisoners (which isn't a war crime only because we won the war).

It should also be noted (but it won't) that even the Judges at the Nuremberg trials ruled that it was NOT a war crime for a perimeter guard to shoot an escaping prisoner.

Next, your comment, undoubtedly fed to you by the USHMM,

that my father lied under oath to gain access to the US is blatantly a lie. Any reporter willing to do any real research would be able to reveal the real fact which is my father answered all the questions he was asked on the immigration form; he entered the fact he was in the Waffen SS, the Division he was in, and the dates. He was never asked to state all the places he had served, so saying he lied is nothing but propaganda (ie, a self serving lie to meet a political end).

It should also be noted (but it won't), that even serving at Mauthausen as a guard would not have been grounds for rejection into the US.

It should be noted (but it won't), that it only became a "crime" with the signing and implementation of the Holtzman Amendment which created the OSI. In effect, it's an ex post facto law - a law enacted which made something previously legal, illegal.

It should be noted (but it won't) that I won a Freedom of Information Act lawsuit against the OSI and then Director Neal Sher (who has since been disbarred for other reasons) that proved that the OSI had exculpatory evidence which they withheld from the court.

So, you see, when you say that "the workshop was designed to provide students with reference materials such as The State of Deception: The Power of Nazi Propaganda,-- You should say that the real "Power of Propaganda" now belongs to USHMM and that the real "Deception" is on the students.

And, lest you think I'm just a lone voice crying in the wilderness, a son who's angry at what happened to his father, I can assure you that there are countless cases of outright fraud and half truths. I pity the poor students who will be indoctrinated in this special kind of government approved propaganda, it's anything but real education - real education allows for cross examination and questioning of evidence, something our government and the USHMM could never, and will never allow.

Heinz (Bartesch)

"If my heart could do my thinking /And my head begin to feel, / I would look upon the world anew / And know what's truly real." Van Morrison

The Murder of History
And the Belfer Foundation for Holocaust Education

Jett Rucker

Here Jett Rucker addresses what The purpose of the Belfer Workshop really is. This text was forwarded to some 2,400 student organizations and faculty at the six chosen campuses.

The School of Education at six campuses nationwide have been selekted by the Arthur and Rochelle Belfer Foundation http://tinyurl.com/d8zoqt to indoctrinate future teachers in a mendacious, politically motivated parody of history dressed up in the righteous trappings of "Holocaust Education." The six institutions include Rhode Island College, Auburn University, St Cloud University, Illinois State University, Cal State University Long Beach, and Northern Colorado University. The program itself was birthed at the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum, effectively a propaganda arm of the U.S. government, managed by self-rewarding special interests.

Our peculiar spelling of "selected," of course, recalls one of the contrived "crimes" for which innocent and even benevolent functionaries in World War II German labor and concentration camps were convicted and sentenced, in some cases to long prison terms, and in many others to death.

Selections, sorting, and classifications are invariably conducted in all places and times where a central authority has gained control over a large group of people, as witness the US Selective Service System, which traditionally selekted young men for service in the US military (and requires them to register even today). Selections in German camps were, necessarily, conducted for many functions, some exploitative, and some beneficent, as when people with contagious diseases are selected for quarantine or people capable of

working are separated from those incapable of working.

But the only selections ever presented or discussed in the highly selective, distorted narrative propagated under the aegis of "Holocaust Education" is one invented by the victorious, vengeful Allies in the aftermath of World War II for purposes of finding Germans to imprison and execute at Nuremberg and many other places—a type of selection that, in fact, may never have occurred, and if it did, its purpose would have been unknown to the hapless soul who conducted it: selection for death.

These deceptions, long celebrated in risible Hollywood confabulations like *Sophie's Choice*, serve to disseminate and perpetuate hatred for Germans and, by extension vigorously prosecuted, for any person such as myself who argues: (a) for a less hate-driven narrative; and (b) for more disinterested, scrupulous attention to actual historical evidence.

I wanted to be sure you were aware that the Belfer Foundation, working in league with the US taxpayer-supported US Holocaust Museum and Memorial, has selekted your School of Education in which to propagate this corrosive mythology, that it may, in turn, be passed on to future generations of innocent schoolchildren. Thus does the warfare state in time-honored fashion inculcate its youth to come forward for death and horrible disfigurement, even while visiting the same on the populations of the designated "enemy."

As a member of one of these six communities, you are involuntarily being made a part of this evil. If you aren't quite in a position to stop it yourself, at least make it known, widely, clearly, and loudly, that you oppose it.

The Germans—virtually all of them—were faulted for not doing so when evil came to them.

The Library Project:

Shafar Nullifidian

Three or four CODOH co-conspirators are visiting college libraries offering a free copy of Bradley's *Break His Bones* to be catalogued and shelved. When, and if, such an event takes place, we would have an opportunity to make the public aware of the dedication to free speech at that college or university.

Such an institution would be noted as one of education and enlightenment instead of being one of the brainwashing indoctrination centers where few cerebral neurons remain in the student body after having been subject to a cynically sinister 12 years of brain burnout, too often presented by dolts, dim bulbs, deluded, disinformed, misinformed, uninformed, mentally, morally, and culturally bankrupt pedagogues who themselves are brain burnt-outs. The extreme few of those who do not fit this bill confirm the verisimilitude of my observations.

Giving the college/university sufficient time to catalogue the book, we will return in 4-5 weeks (surreptitiously?) to check the file catalogue to see if they were only patronizing us. If we find the book catalogued and shelved, we turn cartwheels and go on to the next target. For example:

A Rendezvous Quatre at Rivier College

Rivier College is a Catholic liberal (?) arts college (tending toward the status of University) located in Nashua, NH. As a participant in CODOH's Library Project, I selected Rivier as a target for attempting to have Bradley's *Break His Bones: The Private Life of a Holocaust Revisionist* catalogued and shelved at the college's Regina Library.

On Friday, April 13, 2012 (a less than propitious date, perhaps?), I traveled to the library and spoke to a young lady, a student working her way through college no doubt, and asked to speak to someone about having a book catalogued and placed on the shelves. She informed me that Mr. Dan Speidel, the Library director, was the person with whom I would have to discuss the matter. He was not in and would not be back until Monday.

I briefly explained the book's contents and left a copy along with a copy of *Smith's Report* No. 190. Before leaving, I made small talk with the young lady. I explained that when I first moved to Nashua, much of the current campus was literally farmland. Since she was just a junior she had no idea that

the name of the college infirmary was to honor my late Sister-in-Law, Sister (**** *** ******).

Neither was she aware that the chapel carillon which she heard every day was donated to the college in memory of my mother and father-in-law by (**** ***). My hope was that she might mention these matters to Speidel. Not that this was going to create a "warm and fuzzy" relationship, but it might alleviate open hostility when we did meet.

Monday I traveled to the college again, once again Mr. Speidel was out, was expected back later for he had a 3:30 meeting. I spoke to an older woman, not a student but an employee, who had no idea what the book was about, who left it or why. Once again I went through my spiel to her and another woman with whom I was then left alone at the desk. She had been working at the college for 30 years, knew my sister-in-law well, and we reminisced about (**** ***) and what a wonderful person she was and the tragedy that she died so young and so suddenly.

Monday afternoon I called the library at 4:30 thinking this was plenty of time for Speidel to complete his 3:30 PM meeting. I was transferred to Speidel's phone. He was gone for the day.

Tuesday, the 17th, I once again traveled to the library. Once again I announced myself at the desk and this time an employee said that Amy would be meeting with me. Amy, an older matronly woman, showed up, introduced herself as Assistant Director of the library, and said we would meet in private. She invited another assistant "something" named "something" which, because of my severe hearing problem, never registered. We went to what might have been a storage room or supplies room, but it was definitely not an office.

The meeting was short and coldly cordial. I cannot be certain now in which order the following took place.

My copy of *Break His Bones* and *Smith's Report* were handed to me.

Amy said: "The book is autobiographical and does not comport with the curriculum of the college." She said: "The College receives many outside contributions."

What this was meant to imply, I am not sure. However, my decades of skeptical cynicism led me to infer that such contributions would dry up should word get out that the college had accepted *Bones* and placed it on their shelves where "innocents" would be exposed to it. This is my reflection and mine alone. Someone else may have had a different take.

The other person with Amy just stood there like a "pimple on a pickle" which more or less confirmed my suspicion that she was there to run for help should I suddenly morph into an SS attack Doberman pinscher and go for Amy's throat.

I expressed my disappointment at such censorship, and that although Revisionists in America are not sent to jail for such, they are throughout Europe, but here jobs are lost, and they are made pariahs in their communities. I didn't even get a chance to mention their property being destroyed, and being physically assaulted by Zionasty thugs. They both appeared to be a little taken aback at my comments and more than a little anxious to have me out of their presence, post haste.

I left.

It should be noted that a Holocaust Remembrance ceremony was scheduled for the next evening at the college's Dion Center. I attended. A report on that affair is pending. But it will take a few more days to "talk me down" and for the smoldering embers of my "hair on fire" reaction to burn out.

FRAGMENTS Bradley Smith

continued from page 4

*** On 30 April 2012 David Duke interviewed Germar Rudolf on Duke's online radio talk show, which can be accessed by anyone with access to a computer (everybody?). One of our guys wrote an open letter to Germar expressing her concern that appearing with Duke will compromise Germar's reputation as a scientist and historian. I understood her concern, but I have always said that since I say the same thing to everyone, I will talk to anyone, so I did not have a similar reaction.

Nevertheless. . .

Germar replied to his concerned admirer and sent it around to us. I thought it well done and asked permission to publish it here. Germar replied that he had already posted it on his blog with a brief introductory comment without mentioning the lady's name. He gave me the URL to his blog which he calls: "Welcome to My World." http://tinyurl.com/7ohnov8

"So it's all yours," he said. "In case you find any more typos or awkward expressions, please let me know and I'll fix it."

We then had this email exchange. I am quoted first.

"(Expletive deleted). I didn't even know you *had* a blog. Hernandez didn't know you have a blog. Where have we been? Who knows you have a blog?"

"I just started it," Germar replied. "Don't panick!"

"When? It looks real good."

"Well, you will see the first entry in March. Then the project stalled for four weeks, as I had other things to tend to. Finally I sat down and put stuff up when this latest little scandal broke out driving traffic to my empty site. I figured I need to hoist my flag, so I did."

Below is the letter that Germar wrote to a concerned revisionist and posted on his (new) blog. I think it addresses the issue well. The interview with Duke is here: http://tinyurl.com/76zxwbs

---

May 2, 2012

Yesterday I received an email by a person I do not know. It was a reaction to my having appeared on one of David Duck's radio talk shows on April 30, 2012.

He wrote, among other things: "I am concerned that Germar Rudol[f]'s image as a reputable and objective scientist will be irreparably damaged by his association with David Duke."

This is neither about me nor about David Duke. It is not even about reputation, as neither of us has any to lose, in the eyes of the public at large anyhow. It is about ostracizing others. We, as victims of such societal ills, should be very careful before we do this to others.

You criticize me for talking publicly with a person of alleged ill-repute. David will be criticized the same way for talking to me by some of his adherents who think revisionism unnecessarily encumbers his/their political struggle. So here we all go, diminishing the ranks of our potential listeners and supporters in order to allegedly look better – to whom? Those who denigrate us daily?

You – and everyone else for that matter – should not judge me by the persons I talk to, but by what I say to them. Keep in mind that I will talk to anyone, everyone, who wants to and does talk to me in a civilized manner. One of the things I have learned during my ordeal is that we should NEVER allow our persecutors to define who we are permitted to talk to. Allowing this to happen is like rubber-stamping their acts of persecution as valid, legitimate and appropriate.

And this is something I will never agree to.

Being free to speak with whom we damn well please to speak is a very important part of the very concept of free speech. It should also be a basic principle of human life: speak with and listen to each other rather than harm and kill each other. It would behoove our societal and political leaders well to listen to that advice. But most of them are deaf in that regard, I'm afraid.

Next week I'll be interviewed by Carolyn Yeager. I hope that no one will freak out over that one, although I figure some may cringe.

That's life.

Best, Germar

*** "The Power of the Moment"—a phrase I picked up the other night from Isaiah Berlin where he is writing about Tolstoy. The power of the moment! We live through a galaxy of moments, inconceivably, incomprehensively numerous, yet here and there there is the moment when it happens. That's how it was the moment I understood I would be a writer and again, 25 years later, the moment I understood it was not to be. There were other "moments" of course. I'm going to put something together about a number of them, and how they are related.

Anyhow?

Bradley

Smith's Report
is published by

Committee for
Open Debate
on the Holocaust

Bradley R. Smith, Founder

For your contribution of $39
you will receive 12 issues of
Smith's Report.
Canada and Mexico--$45
Overseas--$49

Letters and Donations to:

Bradley R. Smith
Post Office Box 439016
San Ysidro, CA 92143

Desk: 209 682 5327

Email

bradley1930@yahoo.com